

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

On pages 2-6 of the Office Action, claims 2, 4, 14, 20, 23, 24, 29-34, 39, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,961,811 to Haugwitz (the “Haugwitz patent”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,889,754 to Vargas (the “Vargas patent”).

On page 7 of the Office Action, claims 35, 37, and 39 are rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Haugwitz patent in view of the Vargas patent as applied to claims 2, 4, 14, 20, 23, 24, 29-34, 39, and 40 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,898,323 to Chen, et al. (the “Chen patent”).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 2, 4, 14, 20, 23, 24, 29-35, 37, 39, and 40 for the reasons set forth below.

Applicant presumes that dependent claim 38 is allowable since the Office Action does not include a specific rejection of dependent claim 38.

The Invention

Before addressing the specific claim limitations, it will be helpful first to briefly summarize the invention of the pending claims.

The present invention resides in printable media that includes a sheet defining a front side, a rear side, and at least first and second intersecting side edges, where each of the first and second side edges define opposing longitudinal ends. One of the longitudinal ends of each of the first and second side edges defines a common longitudinal end. Also, the printable media includes a plurality of first strips of adhesive material on one of the front and rear sides of the sheet adjacent to the first side edge and

extending substantially from one longitudinal end of the first side edge to the other longitudinal end of the first side edge. In addition, the printable media includes a plurality of second strips of adhesive material on the one of the front and rear sides of the sheet adjacent to the second side edge and extending substantially from one longitudinal end of the second side edge to the other longitudinal end of the second side edge. Furthermore, the printable media includes a plurality of first liners respectively positioned over the plurality of first strips of adhesive material, and a plurality of second liners respectively positioned over the plurality of second strips of adhesive material.

The present invention also resides in a printable media that includes an at least substantially opaque sheet defining a front side, a rear side, first and second horizontally extending side edges, and first and second vertically extending side edges, where each of the side edges define opposing longitudinal ends. Also, the printable media includes a plurality of horizontally extending strips of pressure sensitive adhesive on the rear side of the at least substantially opaque sheet adjacent to the first horizontally extending side edge and extending substantially from one longitudinal end of the first horizontally extending side edge to the other longitudinal end of the first horizontally extending side edge. In addition, the printable media includes a plurality vertically extending strips of pressure sensitive adhesive on the rear side of the at least substantially opaque sheet adjacent to the first vertically extending side edge and extending substantially from one longitudinal end of the first vertically extending side edge to the other longitudinal end of the first vertically extending side edge. Furthermore, the printable media includes a plurality of closely spaced horizontally extending release liners covering the plurality of horizontally extending strips of pressure sensitive adhesive, and a plurality of closely spaced vertically extending release liners covering the plurality of vertically extending strips of pressure sensitive adhesive.

Rejection of Claims 2, 4, 14, 20, 23, 24, 29-34, 39, and 40 Under U.S.C. § 103(a)
Based Upon the Haugwitz patent in View of the Vargas patent

On pages 2-6 of the Office Action, independent claims 14 and 20, and dependent claims 2, 4, 23, 24, 29-34, 39, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Haugwitz patent in view of the Vargas patent. Dependent claims 4, 23, 24, 34, 39, and 40 depend from independent claim 14, and dependent claims 2, 29-31, amended claim 32, and claim 33 depend from independent claim 20. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection of claims 2, 4, 14, 20, 23, 24, 29-31, amended claim 32, and claims 33, 34, 39, and 40.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner points out that the Haugwitz patent discloses “first and second intersecting side edges . . . a plurality of first strips of adhesive material . . . adjacent to the first side edge . . .” and “first and second horizontally extending side edges . . . first and second vertically extending side edges . . . a plurality of horizontally extending strips of adhesive . . .” On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner states “Haugwitz *fails* to disclose a plurality of second strips of adhesive material . . . adjacent to the second side edge . . .,” as required in independent claim 14 (emphasis added).

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully contends that the Haugwitz patent *fails* to teach or suggest “a plurality of vertically extending strips of pressure sensitive adhesive . . . adjacent to the first vertically extending side edge . . .,” as required by independent claim 20. Additionally, Applicant respectfully contends that the Haugwitz patent *teaches away from* “a plurality of second strips of adhesive material . . . adjacent to the second side edge . . .,” as required by independent claim 14, and “a plurality of vertically extending strips of pressure sensitive adhesive . . . adjacent to the first vertically extending side edge . . .,” as required by independent claim 20. In col. 3, lines 41-45, the Haugwitz patent teaches “[b]y grasping the attached sheet and pulling it in the direction of the edge which bears the dot, dots, line or lines of adhesive, results in virtually flawless separation without substantially damaging the surface of attachment.”

If one were to *erroneously* add to the teaching of the Haugwitz patent “a second plurality of strips of adhesive material . . . adjacent to the second side edge . . .,” or “a plurality of vertically extending strips of pressure sensitive adhesive . . . adjacent to the first vertically extending side edge . . .,” “pulling in the direction of the edge which bears the . . . adhesive . . .,” (col. 3, lines 41-45, the Haugwitz patent) would not be possible since one cannot pull in two directions at once.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner states “Vargas teaches plurality (sic) of second strips of adhesive material on rear sides of the sheet adjacent to the second side edge . . .,” however, Applicant respectfully disagrees. In col. 1, lines 64-65, the Vargas patent teaches “a thin film layer of transparent adhesive applied to one side of the first layer of flexible transparent film . . .,” and in col. 2, lines 66-68, “[s]andwiched between the two transparent film layer 12 and 14 is a thin layer of transparent adhesive 16.” Emphasis added. Additionally, in col. 3, lines 10-11, the Vargas patent teaches “flexible film that can be selectively peeled off, thus exposing *the* adhesive layer 16.” Emphasis added. Accordingly, the Vargas patent *fails* to teach or suggest “a *plurality of first strips* of adhesive material . . . adjacent to the first side edge . . . a *plurality of second strips* of adhesive material . . . adjacent to the second side edge . . .,” as required by independent claim 14, and “a *plurality of horizontally extending strips* of pressure sensitive adhesive . . . adjacent to the first horizontally extending side edge . . . a *plurality of vertically extending strips* of pressure sensitive adhesive . . . adjacent to the first vertically extending side edge . . .,” as required by independent claim 20 (emphasis added).

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner states the following: “Haugwitz fails to disclose . . . a plurality of first liners respectively positioned over the plurality of first strips of adhesive material; and a plurality of second liners respectively positioned over the plurality of second strips of adhesive material . . .” Additionally, on page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner states “Vargas teaches . . . a plurality of first liners respectively positioned over the plurality of first strips of adhesive material (Column 3, lines 1-15); and a plurality of second liners respectively positioned over the plurality of

second strips of adhesive material (Column 3, lines 1-15) . . . ,” however, Applicant respectfully disagrees. In col. 3, lines 1-15 of the Vargas patent, precut lines 18, 19, 20, and 21 are taught. These precut lines also are shown in FIG. 1. Only precut line 21 is shown dividing the thin film 14 into a plurality of strips. None of the other precut lines divide the thin film 14 into a plurality of strips, nor is there a suggestion in the Vargas patent to cut any of the precut lines 18, 19, or 20 into a second plurality of strips. Accordingly, the Vargas patent *fails* to teach or suggest “*a plurality of first liners* respectively positioned over the plurality of first strips of adhesive material; *and a plurality of second liners* respectively positioned over the plurality of second strips of adhesive material,” as required by independent claim 14, and “*a plurality of closely spaced horizontally extending release liners* covering the plurality of horizontally extending strips of pressure sensitive adhesive; *and a plurality of closely spaced vertically extending release liners* covering the plurality of vertically extending strips of pressure sensitive adhesive,” as required by independent claim 20 (emphasis added).

Accordingly, *neither* the Haugwitz patent, *nor* the Vargas patent, *nor* the combination of the Haugwitz patent with the Vargas patent teach or suggest “at least first and second intersecting side edges . . . a plurality of first strips of adhesive material . . . adjacent to the first side edge . . . a plurality of second strips of adhesive material . . . adjacent to the second side edge . . . a plurality of first liners respectively positioned over the plurality of first strips of adhesive material; and a plurality of second liners respectively positioned over the plurality of second strips of adhesive material,” as required by independent claim 14, or “first and second horizontally extending side edges, and first and second vertically extending side edges . . . a plurality of horizontally extending strips of pressure sensitive adhesive . . . adjacent to the first horizontally extending side edge . . . a plurality of vertically extending strips of pressure sensitive adhesive . . . adjacent to the first vertically extending side edge . . . a plurality of closely spaced horizontally extending release liners covering the plurality of horizontally extending strips of pressure sensitive adhesive; and a plurality of closely spaced vertically extending release liners covering the plurality of vertically extending strips of pressure sensitive adhesive,” as required by independent claim 20. Therefore, Applicant submits

that the § 103(a) rejection of independent claims 14 and 20, and dependent claims 2, 4, 23, 24, 29-31, amended dependent claim 32, and dependent claims 33, 34, 39, and 40, which depend from either independent claims 14 or independent claim 20, is improper and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 35, 37, and 39 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based Upon the Haugwitz, Vargas, and Chen Patents

On page 7 of the Office Action, dependent claims 35, 37, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Haugwitz patent in view of the Vargas patent, and further in view of the Chen Patent. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection of dependent claims 35, 37, and 39.

Dependent claims 35, 37, and 39 depend from independent claim 14. As discussed above, *neither* the Haugwitz patent, *nor* the Vargas patent, *nor* the combination of the Haugwitz patent with the Vargas patent teach or suggest “at least first and second intersecting side edges . . . a plurality of first strips of adhesive material . . . adjacent to the first side edge . . . a plurality of second strips of adhesive material . . . adjacent to the second side edge . . .,” as required by independent claim 14.

The Chen patent does *not* overcome the shortcomings of the Haugwitz and Vargas patents. The Chen patent *fails* to teach or suggest “at least first and second intersecting side edges . . . a plurality of first strips of adhesive material . . . adjacent to the first side edge . . . a plurality of second strips of adhesive material . . . adjacent to the second side edge . . .,” as required by independent claim 14.

Accordingly, *neither* the Haugwitz patent, the Vargas patent, *nor* the Chen patent, *nor* the combination of the Haugwitz, Vargas and Chen patents teach or suggest “at least first and second intersecting side edges . . . a plurality of first strips of adhesive material . . . adjacent to the first side edge . . . a plurality of second strips of adhesive material . . . adjacent to the second side edge . . .,” as required by independent claim 14. Therefore,

Applicant submits that the § 103(a) rejection of independent claims 35, 37, and 39, which depend from independent claim 14, is improper and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant believes the amendments and arguments set forth place this application in condition for allowance. An early notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application not in condition for a notice of allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned practitioner at the telephone number listed below to discuss steps to place the application into condition for allowance. Payment for fees due in connection with the filing of this amendment is made via credit card. In the event of a payment deficiency, or if additional fees are due, please charge the fees to Avery Dennison's Deposit Account No. 013025.

Respectfully submitted,
AVERY DENNISON CORPORATION

Dated: 03/25/09

By: /Ronald Ugolick – Reg. No. 57,080/
Ronald Ugolick – Reg. No. 57,080

Customer No. 63543
Avery Dennison Corporation
Law Department
150 North Orange Grove Boulevard
Pasadena, California 91103
Phone (714) 674-8128; Fax (626) 304-2251